



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,939	08/24/2001	Janakiram Koka	YAHOO-01008US1 2665	
23910 75	590 01/07/2005		EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP			HERNANDEZ, OLGA	
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			2144	

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/938,939	KOKA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Olga Hernandez	2144			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication approximation of Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Six (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the provision of	1. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tined by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	August 2001.				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.	•			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)[· ·					
Applicat	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠	D)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>8/24/01</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen	t(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔀 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u> .	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	ater atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/938,939

Art Unit: 2144

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1, in line 2, it is specified that the web page is divide in at least one chunk. The whole web page is considered to be one chunk, being like this, the web page should be divided in at least two chunks; otherwise, it would not be divided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraus (6,266,684).

As per claim 1, Kraus discloses:

- determining the chunk size limit (column 5, lines 15-18);

dividing the web page data into segments having a size no greater that the chunk size
 limit (column 5, lines 15-18 and abstract); and

- linking the chunks in sequence (column 2, line 67).

As per claims 2, 3, 14 and 15, Kraus discloses the use of HTML language (column 2, lines 56-67) in which the use of sequential or non-sequential links is a designer's choice.

As per claims 4 and 13, Kraus discloses a plain text markup language (column 2, lines 56-67) used to describe the appearance of an electronic document, most frequently used to construct Web pages. For format instructions, HTML specifies standard tags, which are interpreted by a browser. HTML allows the generation of highly sophisticated documents, which can be linked with other data types (primarily graphics and other documents, but also video and sound clips). Derived from Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML).¹

As per claims 5 and 16, Kraus discloses determining the point on the page where the chunk size limit is reached and creating a list of URL to subsequent chunks of the page (column 5, lines 62-67 and column 6, lines 1-8).

As per claims 6 and 17, Kraus discloses determining the chunk size limit falls on a word, URL or element boundary and establishing the break point at a position prior to the word, URL or element boundary (column 6, lines 1-22).

As per claims 7, 8, 18 and 19, Kraus discloses the break point falling on a word, new line tab (column 6, lines 9-22).

As per claims 9, 11 and 20, Kraus discloses creating a list of URL identifying each of the segments and fixing the URLs in the segments (column 3, lines 1-9, column 6, lines 1-8).

¹ LexiCAT Dictionary Copyright 1995-1998

As per claims 10 and 21, specifying meta data involves two steps:

1. Declaring a property and a value for that property. This may be done in two ways:

- 1. From within a document, via the META element.
- 2. From outside a document, by linking to meta data via the <u>LINK</u> element (see the section on link types).
- 2. Referring to a profile where the property and its legal values are defined. To designate a profile, use the profile attribute of the <u>HEAD</u> element.

As per claim 12, Kraus discloses:

- determining where the gateway limit falls in the content data (column 5, lines 62-67, column 6, lines 1-8); and
- parsing the content data into at least a first segment and at least a next segment of a size at or below the gateway limit at break points not falling within a word, URL or element boundary (column 5, lines 15-18, column 6, lines 1-8 and abstract).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7144.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/938,939

Art Unit: 2144

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Olga Hernandez Examiner Art Unit 2144